

REMARKS

Claims 37–72 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 37–43, 45, 46, 48–50 and 52–72 are amended. The amendments to the claims merely correct minor informalities, amend claims 56–72 to comply with the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §101, support for which is on, for example, page 7, lines 13–21, of the specification, and amend the claims to recite "frame dimension fixed state" and "frame dimension alterable state," support for which is on, for example, Fig. 9 and the corresponding portions of the specification. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims in view of at least the following remarks.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Tsui in the July 9, 2009 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 56–72 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly not directed to statutory subject matter because the claims are directed to a computer program that is not embodied on a computer readable medium. Applicant amends claims 56–72 to comply with the requirements of §101, as recited above. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 37–41, 43–47, 55–60 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023627 (Kerr). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kerr fails to disclose "operation modes including at least a frame dimension fixed state and a frame dimension alterable state" and "a frame configuration alteration system that alters memory contents of the frame configuration storage system so that the character string stored in the character information storage system will fit in the frame," as recited in claim 37 (emphasis added).

As discussed during the July 9, 2009 personal interview, Examiner Tsui initially interpreted "frame configuration fixed state" and "frame configuration alterable state" as reading on any fixed or alterable characteristic of the configuration of the frame. Applicant amends the claims to clarify that it is the dimensions of the frame that are fixed or alterable in the frame dimension fixed state and the frame dimension alterable state, respectively.

Kerr discloses that a user may enter text fill 203 into a fill box 193 that requires a greater amount of space on a digital document 196 than is afforded by an associated (corresponding) text portion 199 (Kerr, paragraph [0032] and Fig. 2). When this happens, Kerr discloses that the text fill 203 is copy fitted using copy fitting techniques to fit the text fill 203 into the associated text portion 199 of the digital document 196 (Kerr, paragraph [0032]). Kerr discloses that the copy fitting techniques may result in text that is not recognizable on the digital document 196 or text that is greatly reduced in size within the associated text portions 199 (Kerr, paragraph [0032]). The copy fitting techniques concern adjusting the size of the text fill 203 to fit into the associated text portion 199 (Kerr, paragraphs [0043]–[0046]). Importantly, despite the Office Action's allegation that Kerr discloses the "frame configuration alteration system" of claim 37, Kerr fails to disclose an operation where the associated text portion 199 is adjusted to fit the text fill 203. At least because Kerr fails to disclose that the associated text portion 199 is adjusted, Kerr fails to disclose "operation modes including at least a frame dimension fixed state and a frame dimension alterable state" and "a frame configuration alteration system that alters memory contents of the frame configuration storage system so that the character string stored in the character information storage system will fit in the frame," where the "frame configuration storage system [] stores a configuration of a frame in which the character string stored in the character information storage system is displayed or printed," as recited in claim 37.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 37 is allowable over Kerr. Because claim 56 recites similar features as claim 37, Applicant asserts that claim 56 is also allowable over Kerr. Claims 38–41, 43–47, 55, 57–60 and 72 are also allowable over Kerr, at least for the same reasons as claims 37 and 56, as well as for the additional features the claims recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


The Office Action rejects claims 42, 48–54, 61 and 65–71 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kerr in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,737 (King). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

This rejection is based on the allegation that Kerr discloses all of the features of claims 37 and 56. As discussed above, Kerr does not disclose all of the features of claims 37 and 56. Further, King does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Kerr. Thus, claims 42, 48–54, 61 and 65–71, which depend from claims 37 and 56, are also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features the claims recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Patrick T. Muffo
Registration No. 60,342

JAO:KRG/jnm

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: July 28, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
